Mile2 Ray Friedman Re: Malicious fake complaints that breach trade practice statutes enforced by FTC & Recommendations for amendments.

Suggested changes to the ironically titled Law - Section 230(c)(1) of the Communications Decency Act by Ray Friedman Mile2.com

Ray Friedman of Mile2 Reviews the US federal law that is titled the "Communications Decency Act", specifically 47 U.S.C. Section 230(c)(1), was put into effect in 1996. This was long before Google decided "... to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful". The law was passed to shield the then newcomer Internet industry against specific public liability matters, so as not to endanger its growth.



The Internet is most likely now the most powerful industry on earth. Publishers within the internet industry no longer need the sweeping immunity offered by § 230C. The law protects providers from liability for the unintentional or deliberate circulation of harmful imputations, defamation, tortious interference for prospective monetary gain and blackmail.

Though this is a matter for amendment by the U.S. Congress, the FTC has compelling influence with legislators, and must, therefore, get involved.

The § 230(c) escape clause is outdated; it must be modified with stipulations that put into effect reasonable duty of care requirements on the likes of Google, Facebook and other Silicon Valley goliaths, who are willfully ignorant to the day to day torment induced to individuals and companies, smeared by malicious libel which is perpetuated through these powerful online platforms.

The following is an illustration of customary misconduct through the Section 230(c) loophole. Any person can anonymously publish bogus claims against any other individual or company, through a variety of notorious websites. Soon afterwards, the injurious libel posted on these websites appear in Google search results for the individual or business named. The website administrators will then contact the defamed party and propose to alleviate the libel, for a fee - a classic shake-down. Mile2 was the recipient of these extortion demands. In the absence of the

loophole protection of Section 230(c), this would be tantamount to criminal extortion, and the website would also be guilty of libel. But, due to the federal supremacy of § 230(c), the websites are permitted to exact these payments from their victims; with immunity.

Section 230(c) allows the content providers, **including Google**, to disregard the desperate demands of the victims to redact the defamation.

The following clause needs an urgent amendment:

230(c)(1) "No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider."

It should be changed to the following effect:

"No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider, as long as that provider illustrates a sensible duty of care to third parties who are defamed, pestered, or in another way harmed, by web content under the provider's control and once the injured party has notified the provider of the existence of the false material".

This duty of care should extend to Google, as much as it needs to for the blackmail sites. Google essentially cites 230(c)(1) as a reason for not deindexing defamatory search results from its proprietary search index, when harmed parties in the USA request removal. **Google DOES NOT have this immunity in ANY OTHER COUNTRY!**

I, Ray Friedman of Mile2 IT Security Consulting & Training, request that the FTC applies its considerable influence in persuading lawmakers in the United States Congress, to bring about amendments to this law. This law might be actually identified as "State-Sponsored Internet Terrorism".

Very respectfully published by,

Ray Friedman

Mile2 IT Security

www.mile2.com/ray-friedman-mile2/

